DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 290 EA 031 856

AUTHOR	Westheimer, Joel; Kahne, Joseph
TITLE	What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy.
SPONS AGENCY	Surdna Foundation, Inc., New York, NY.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Citizenship; *Citizenship Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Political Attitudes; Political Issues; *Politics of Education

ABSTRACT

The notion of democracy occupies a privileged place in our society. Educators and policymakers are increasingly pursuing a variety of programs to promote democracy through civic education, service learning, and other pedagogies. The nature of their underlying beliefs, however, differs. This article underscores the political implications of education for democracy and suggests that the narrow and often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship embedded in many current efforts at teaching for democracy reflects not arbitrary choices but rather political choices with political consequences. Three conceptions of the "good" citizen are treated in this article: personally responsible, participatory, and justice oriented. They emerged from an analysis of both democratic theory and a 2-year study of educational programs aiming to promote democracy. Drawing on quantitative and qualitative data from two of the programs studied, it is argued that these conceptions embody significantly different beliefs regarding the capacities and commitments citizens need for democracy to flourish, and they carry significantly different implications for pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation, and educational policy. The authors conclude that politics and the interests of varied groups are often deeply embedded in the ways efforts to educate for democracy are conceptualized, implemented, and studied. (Contains 34 references and 3 tables.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

TM

ED 468 290

WHAT KIND OF CITIZEN?

THE POLITICS OF EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY

Joel Westheimer
University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
145 Jean-Jaques Lussier
Lamoureux Hall, Rm. 486
Ottawa, Ontario K1n 6n5
joelwestheimer@mac.com
613-230-8077

Joseph Kahne
Mills College
5000 MacArthur Blvd
Oakland, CA 94613
jkahne@mills.edu
(510)430-3275

Paper to be presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, LA

April 2, 2002

EA 031 856

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. WESTHEIMER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The notion of democracy occupies a privileged place in our society. Educators and policymakers are increasingly pursuing a broad variety of programs that aim to promote democracy through civic education, service learning, and other pedagogies. The nature of their underlying beliefs, however, differ. For some, a commitment to democracy is associated with liberal notions of freedom, while for others democracy is primarily about equality of opportunity. For some, civil society is the key, while others place their hope for social change in healthy free markets. For some, good citizens in a democracy volunteer, while for others they take active parts in political processes by voting, forming committees, or protesting. "What Kind of Citizen?" calls attention to this spectrum of ideas about what good citizenship *is* and what good citizens *do*. We underscore the political implications of education for democracy and suggest that the narrow and often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship embedded in many current efforts at teaching for democracy reflects not arbitrary choices but rather political choices with political consequences.

In this article, we detail three conceptions of the "good" citizen: *personally responsible, participatory*, and *justice oriented*. These emerged from our analysis of both democratic theory and our two year study of educational programs that aim to promote democracy. Drawing on both quantitative and qualitative data from two of the programs we studied, we argue that these three conceptions embody significantly different beliefs regarding the capacities and commitments citizens need in order for democracy to flourish; and they carry significantly different implications for pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation, and educational policy. We conclude that politics and the interests of varied groups are often deeply embedded in the ways we conceptualize, implement, and study efforts to educate for democracy.

WHAT KIND OF CITIZEN?

THE POLITICS OF EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY

The notion of democracy occupies a privileged place in our society. Everyone believes democracy is desirable. Indeed, educators, policymakers, politicians, and community activists alike pursue dozens of agendas for change under the banner of furthering democracy. The nature of their underlying beliefs, however, differ. For some, a commitment to democracy is associated with liberal notions of freedom, while for others democracy is primarily about equality or equality of opportunity. For some, civil society is the key, while others place their hope for social change in healthy free markets. For some, good citizens in a democracy volunteer, while for others they take active parts in political processes by voting, forming committees, protesting, and working on campaigns. It is not surprising, then, that the growing number of educational programs that seek to further democracy by nurturing "good" citizens embody a similarly broad variety of goals and practices.

We titled this article "What Kind of Citizen?" to call attention to the spectrum of ideas about what good citizenship *is* and what good citizens *do* that are embodied by democratic education programs nationwide. We added the subtitle "The Politics of Education for Democracy" to underscore our belief that the narrow and often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship embedded in many current efforts at teaching for democracy reflects neither arbitrary choices nor pedagogical limitations but rather political choices with political consequences.

We spent two years studying ten programs that shared a basic set of priorities: they all hoped to teach good citizenship (through civics curriculum, service learning, and other means) by engaging students in analysis and action on community issues. But the different curricula we

examined affected students in a variety of ways, not all of which were shared across programs. Moreover, the meanings leaders of these programs brought to notions of citizenship and to the term "democratic values" varied significantly. In our study, we were interested in these kinds of questions:

- What kind of citizen does each program aim to develop?
- How do students of these programs see themselves engaging in civic life?

In what follows, we detail three conceptions of citizenship that emerged from our analysis of both democratic theory and program goals and practices. We then describe two of the ten programs we studied and share data–both quantitative and qualitative–that illustrate the need for more discriminating analyses of programs that seek to nurture good citizens. We will be making the case that educators need to take into account the varied notions of citizenship reflected in different programs and that decisions we make in designing as well as researching these programs are, in fact, political.

What Kind of Citizen?

Philosophers, historians and political scientists have long debated which conceptions of citizenship would best advance democracy (Kaestle, 2000; Smith, 1997; Schudson, 1998). This wide range of perspectives, while part of a vital intellectual discourse, does not necessarily provide sufficient focus for those studying educational efforts with democratic aims.

In mapping the terrain that surrounds the teaching of democratic values and, in particular, the efforts of the 10 programs in our study, we found that three visions of "good" citizens emerged that could help make sense of the variation: the *personally responsible citizen*; the *participatory citizen*; and the *justice oriented citizen* (see Table 1). We focus on these three visions because they satisfy both theoretical and practitioner-based criteria. First, each vision is

linked to scholarly dialogs of educational and political philosophers who concern themselves with the civic and democratic purposes of education. Specifically, there is a long tradition of making honesty, integrity, responsibility, and other virtues central aims for educators (Horace Mann, 1838, for example; and currently, Lickona, 1993; Wynne, 1986). As we elaborate below, we associate these qualities with personally responsible citizens. Similarly, those who believe that education for democracy entails development of capacities and commitments for civic participation (See Boyte and Kari, 1996; Verba et al., 1995 for example) often consider schooling's impact on qualities we associate with the participatory citizen. Finally, frequently building on the work of the social reconstructionists (Rugg, 1921; Counts, 1932) and of Paulo Freire (1990), educators who believe that education for democracy requires attention to causes of injustice and potential remedies often attend to priorities we associate with the justice oriented citizen.

At the same time that these three categories align with prominent theoretical perspectives, they also were chosen in an effort to highlight ideas and ideals that resonate with practitioners (teachers, administrators, and curriculum designers). To that end, we consulted with both the 10 teams of educators whose work we studied and with other leaders in the field in an effort to create categories and descriptions that aligned well with and communicated clearly their differing priorities[1].

[1] Our desire to respond to prominent educational theories related to democratic ideals and to develop a framework that practitioners would find both clear and meaningful led us to modify our categories in several ways. For example, we began this study emphasizing a distinction between "charity" and "change". We had used this distinction in earlier writing (Kahne and Westheimer, 1996). Through the course of our work, however, it became clear that this distinction did not do enough to capture main currents in dialogs of practitioners and scholars regarding democratic educational goals and ways to achieve them. In addition, once our three categories were identified, we found that some of our rhetoric failed to clearly convey our intent. For example, we had initially titled our third category the "social reconstructionist." As a result of dialogs with practitioners this was changed to the "social reformer" and finally to the "justice oriented citizen."

A caveat: although these three categories were chosen to highlight important differences in the ways educators conceive of democratic educational aims, we do not mean to imply that a given program might not simultaneously further more than one of these agendas. These categories were not designed to be mutually exclusive. For instance, while a curriculum designed principally to promote personally responsible citizens will generally look quite different than one that focuses primarily on developing capacities and commitments for participatory citizenship, it is possible for a given curriculum to further both goals. Indeed, when discussing the Bayside Students for Justice curriculum below, we will highlight the ways it incorporated a concern for personal responsibility into it's focus on broader issues of justice. At the same time that such overlap may occur, we believe that drawing attention to the distinctions between these visions of citizenship is important. It focuses attention on the underlying goals and assumptions that drive different programs in design and practice.

The Personally Responsible Citizen

The *personally responsible citizen* acts responsibly in his/her community by, for example, picking up litter, giving blood, recycling, volunteering, and staying out of debt. The personally responsible citizen works and pays taxes, obeys laws, and helps those in need during crises such as snowstorms or floods. The personally responsible citizen contributes to food or clothing drives when asked and volunteers to help those less fortunate whether in a soup kitchen or a senior center. S/he might contribute time, money, or both to charitable causes.

Both those in the character education movement and many of those who advocate community service would emphasize this individualistic vision of good citizenship. Programs that seek to develop personally responsible citizens hope to build character and personal

responsibility by emphasizing honesty, integrity, self-discipline, and hard work (Lickona, 1993; Wynne, 1986).[2] The Character Counts! Coalition, for example, advocates teaching students to "treat others with respect…deal peacefully with anger…be considerate of the feelings of others…follow the Golden Rule…use good manners" and so on. They want students not to "threaten, hit, or hurt anyone [or use] bad language" (Character Counts!, 1996). Other programs that seek to develop personally responsible citizens hope to nurture compassion by engaging students in volunteer activities. As illustrated in the mission of the Points of Light Foundation, these programs hope to "help solve serious social problems" by "engag[ing] more people more effectively in volunteer service" (www.pointsoflight.org, April 2000).

The Participatory Citizen

Other educators see good citizens as those who actively participate in the civic affairs and the social life of the community at local, state, and national levels. We call this kind of citizen the *participatory citizen*. Proponents of this vision emphasize preparing students to engage in collective, community-based efforts. Educational programs designed to support the development of participatory citizens focus on teaching students about how government and other institutions (eg. community based organizations, churches) works and about the importance of planning and participating in organized efforts to care for those in need, for example, or in efforts to guide school policies. Skills associated with such collective endeavors–how to run a meeting, for example–are also viewed as important (Newmann, 1975). While the personally responsible

---

[2] See also Schudson, *The Good Citizen*, 1998 for his discussion of 'colonial citizenship' "built on social hierarchy…and the traditions of public service, personal integrity, [and] charitable giving…" (294).

citizen would contribute cans of food for the homeless, the participatory citizen would be out organizing the food drive.

In the tradition of De Tocqueville, proponents of participatory citizenship argue that civic participation transcends particular community problems or opportunities. It also develops relationships, common understandings, trust, and collective commitments. This perspective, like Benjamin Barber's notion of "strong democracy," adopts a broad notion of the political sphere – one in which citizens "with competing but overlapping interests can contrive to live together communally" (1984, 118).

Similar themes have been emphasized throughout this nation's history. Dewey put forward a vision of "Democracy as a Way of Life" and emphasized participation in collective endeavors. To support the efficacy of these collective efforts, he also emphasized commitments to communication, experimentation, and scientifically informed dialogues. Such commitments were also prevalent in the educational writings of the Nation's Founders. Jefferson, Franklin, and others viewed informed participation in civic life as a fundamental support for a democratic society and saw education as a chief means for furthering this goal (Pangle & Pangle, 1993).

[PLACE TABLE 1 APPROXIMATELY HERE]

The Justice Oriented Citizen

Our third image of a good citizen is, perhaps, the perspective that is least commonly pursued. Justice oriented citizens critically assess social, political, and economic structures and explore collective strategies for change that challenge injustice and, when possible, address root causes of problems. The vision of the justice oriented citizen shares with the vision of the

participatory citizen an emphasis on collective work related to the life and issues of the community. Its emphasis on responding to social problems and to structural critique make it somewhat different, however. Educational programs that emphasize social change seek to prepare students to improve society by critically analyzing and addressing social issues and injustices. These programs are less likely to emphasize the need for charity and volunteerism as ends in themselves and more likely to teach about social movements and how to effect systemic change. While those who support the development of participatory citizens might emphasize developing students' skills and commitments so that they could and would choose to organize the collection of clothing for members of the community who can't afford it, those who seek to support the development of justice oriented citizens would emphasize helping students challenge structural causes of poverty and devise possible responses. In other words, if participatory citizens are organizing the food drive and personally responsible citizens are donating food, justice oriented citizens are asking why people are hungry and acting on what they discover. That today's citizens are "bowling alone" (Putnam, 2000) would worry those focused on civic participation. Those who emphasize social justice, however, would worry more that when citizens do get together, they often fail to focus on or to critically analyze the social economic, and political structures that generate problems.

The strongest proponents of this perspective were likely the Social Reconstructionists who gained their greatest hearing between the two world wars. Educators like Harold Rugg (1921) argued that the teaching of history in particular and the school curriculum more generally should be developed in ways that connect with important and enduring social problems. George Counts (1932) asked, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" He wanted educators to critically assess varied social and economic institutions while also "engag[ing] in the positive task of creating a new tradition in American life" (262). These educators emphasized that truly

effective citizens needed opportunities to analyze and understand the interplay of social, economic, and political forces and to take part in projects through which they might develop skills and commitments for working collectively to improve society.

Conflicting Priorities

It follows that if program goals and practices aim to develop different kinds of citizens and thereby advance different visions of democracy, then program developers, educational researchers, and funders should be cognizant of and address these differences in their work. Yet conceptions of democratic values and citizenship and the idea of what a good citizen does continue to be narrowly construed.

Most commonly, emphasis is placed on personal responsibility—especially by the character education and community service movements, both of which are well-funded efforts to bring about these particular kinds of reforms. We find this emphasis an inadequate response to the challenges of educating a democratic citizenry. The limits of character education and of volunteerism and the conservative political orientation reflected in many of these efforts have been addressed elsewhere in some detail. Critics note that the emphasis placed on individual character and behavior obscures the need for collective and often public sector initiatives; that this emphasis distracts attention from analysis of the causes of social problems and from systemic solutions; that volunteerism and kindness are put forward as ways of avoiding politics and policy (Barber, 1992; Boyte, 1991; Westheimer and Kahne, 2000; Kahne and Westheimer, 1996).

As a way of illustrating what we see as the limitations of personally responsible citizenship, recall the central tenets of the Character Counts! Coalition. Certainly honesty, integrity, and responsibility for one's actions are valuable character traits for good neighbors and

citizens. But, on their own, these traits are not inherently about democracy. To the extent that these traits detract from other important democratic priorities, they hinder rather than make possible democratic participation and change. For example, a focus on loyalty or obedience (common componenets of character education as well) work against the kind of critical reflection and action many assume are essential in a democratic society. Personal responsibility must be considered in a broader social context or it risks advancing mere civility or docility instead of democracy. Indeed, government leaders in a totalitarian regime would be as delighted as leaders in a democracy if their young citizens learned the lessons put forward by many of the proponents of personally responsible citizenship: don't do drugs; show up to school; show up to work; give blood; help others during a flood; recycle; pick up litter; clean up a park; treat old people with respect. Chinese leader Jiang Zemin along with George W. Bush (and Al Gore, for that matter) would argue that these are desirable traits for people living in a community. But they are not about democratic citizenship.

Reinforcing these criticisms of an exclusive focus on personally responsible citizenship, a study commissioned by the National Association of Secretaries of State (1999) found that less than 32 percent of eligible voters between the ages of 18 and 24 voted in the 1996 presidential election (in 1972, the comparable number was 50 percent), but that a whopping 94 percent of those aged 15-24 believed that "the most important thing I can do as a citizen is to help others" (also see Sax, et al., 1999). In a very real sense, youth seem to be "learning" that citizenship does not require government, politics, or even collective endeavors.

Research and evaluation of educational programs also reflect this conservative and individualistic conception of personally responsible citizenship. Studies commonly ask participants, for example, whether they feel it is their responsibility to take care of those in need

and whether problems of pollution and toxic waste are "everyone's responsibility" or "not my responsibility." They rarely ask questions about corporate responsibility—in what ways industries should be regulated, for example—or about ways government policies can advance or hinder solutions to social problems. Survey questions typically emphasize individual and charitable acts. They ignore important influences like social movements and government policy on efforts to improve society. Educators who seek to teach personally responsible citizenship and researchers who study their programs focus on individual acts of compassion and kindness not on collective social action and the pursuit of social justice (Kahne, Westheimer, and Rogers, 2001).

In contrast to advocates of personally responsible citizenship, some political theorists, sociologists, historians, and educators have championed the importance of civic participation. In *Making Democracy Work* (1993), for example, Robert Putnam argues that participation in civic life and the development of "social capital" are essential. Harry Boyte and Nan Kari make similar arguments in their case for the "democratic promise of public work" (1996). They join a growing number of educators who want to teach the knowledge and skills necessary for civic engagement in community affairs. Advocates of participatory citizenship want students to be schooled in both the broad and minute challenges specific to democratic participation.

Placing social justice at the center of their arguments, other educators and theorists stress that critical analysis and liberatory pedagogy are essential for democratic education. Citizens, according to this view, need not only skills associated with participation but also those required to critically analyze and act on root causes of social problems and inequities. These actions include forms of participation that challenge existing power structures and focus on social change (see, for example, Shor, 1992 and Ayers et al., 1998).

Often, democratic theorists blend commitments to participation with commitments to justice. For example, Barber, writing about the importance of participation in what he calls a "strong democracy," focuses on forms of civic engagement that are "persuasively progressive and democratic…useful especially to those who are partisans of democratic struggle and social justice" (1998, 10). Similarly, Boyte and Kari (1996) invoke the populist tradition and emphasize the need to recognize the talent, intelligence, and capacities of ordinary people by engaging them in collective civic projects. They stress the importance of forms of civic participation that have historically been used to pursue social justice showcasing, for example, the work of civil rights activists who used nonviolent actions of civil disobedience.

From the standpoint of supporting the development of democratic communities, combining these commitments is rational. Developing commitments for civic participation and social justice as well as fostering the capacities to fulfill these commitments will support the development of a more democratic society. We should be wary of assuming that commitments to participatory citizenship and to justice necessarily align, however. These two orientations have potentially differing implications for educators. While pursuit of both goals may well support development of a more democratic society, it is not clear whether making advances along one dimension will necessarily further progress on the other. Do programs that support civic participation necessarily promote students' capacities for critical analysis and social change? Conversely, does focusing on social justice provide the foundation for effective and committed civic actors? Or might such programs support the development of students who have articulate conversations over coffee, without ever acting? We now turn to these questions.

Since a significant body of work already addresses the conflicts and limitations of equating personal responsibility with democratic citizenship (for example, Barber, 1992; Boyte,

1991; Westheimer & Kahne, 2000; Kahne and Westheimer, 1996), we focus the empirical analysis in this article on the subtle and not so subtle differences between programs that emphasize participation and those that emphasize justice. Below, we describe two of the programs we studied to draw attention to the differences in their civic and democratic priorities and to the tensions these differences raise for educators. Both programs worked with classes of high school students and both initiatives were designed to support the development of democratic and civic understandings and commitments. But their goals and strategies differed. The first, which we call Madison County Youth in Public Service, aims to develop participatory citizens; the second, which we call Bayside Students for Justice, aims to develop justice-oriented citizens.

Method

Sample

This paper focuses on data from two of the ten programs around the country studied as part of the Surdna Foundation's Democratic Values Initiative. "Madison County Youth in Public Service" was located in a suburban/rural East Coast community outside a city of roughly 23,000 people. Two teachers were involved in this project, one from each of the county's high schools. Each year, the teachers worked with one of their government classes. Over two years, four classes participated. Students needed to request to participate in this version of the 12th grade government class, and teachers characterized participants as slightly better than average in terms of academic background. Students who enrolled in the Advanced Placement government course could not participate. More girls (59 percent) than boys (41 percent) participated. Although we

were not able to collect reports on students' ethnicity, teachers characterized the student population as almost entirely European American (with a few recent immigrants). An estimated three- percent of the school's students are persons of color.

"Bayside Students For Justice" was a curriculum developed as part of a 12th grade Social Studies course for low-achieving students in a comprehensive urban high school on the West Coast. A total of 25 students took part in the program, and 21 of them completed both pre and post surveys. Taking the survey were 13 females (62%) and 8 males (38%), 8 African Americans (38%), 1 Caucasian (5%), 8 Asian or Pacific Islander (38%), 1 Latino (5%), and 3 Others (10%). The group tested roughly at national norms and was relatively low-income with 40 percent living in public housing (data provided by the instructor).

Design

Our study employs a mixed-methods approach – it combines qualitative data from observations and interviews with quantitative analysis of pre/post survey data. Our rationale for adopting a mixed-methods approach reflects what Lois-ellin Datta (1997) has labeled "the pragmatic basis" for mixed-method designs. That is, we employed the combination of methods we felt were best suited to our inquiry – the methods that would best enable us to gain insight and to communicate what we learned to relevant audiences (also see Patton, 1988). In part, our attraction to mixing methods stems from recognition of the limits of each particular method of inquiry. By collecting data through interviews, observations, and surveys we are able to triangulate – to see if different forms of data lead us to similar or divergent findings (for a discussion of mixed-methods and triangulation seen Greene and Caracelli, 1997). In addition,

we employed differing methods to take advantage of the strengths of particular approaches as a means of gaining insight and of enabling effective communication of findings.

The pre/post survey design was used because it enabled systematic assessment of how varied programs influenced all participants in relation to a standardized set of criteria. Our qualitative interviews and observations, on the other hand, were particularly helpful in enabling us probe more deeply to understand and consider what students meant by survey responses to questions that asked them to assess their level of agreement with statements such as, "I am extremely committed to being an active citizen." These qualitative methods also help us understand the nature and significance of curricular differences between programs as well as the relationship between particular approaches and their impact. Finally, multiple methods can facilitate more effective, meaningful, and persuasive communication of findings (see, for example, Cronbach, 1982). Our desire to speak to both practitioners and scholars and to present findings that are viewed as relevant to those with preferences for qualitative or quantitative data made use of multiple methods desirable.

Procedures

We collected four forms of data: observations, interviews, surveys, and documents prepared by program staff. Each year, our observations took place over a two to three day period in classrooms and at service sites. In some instances we were also able to observe formal public presentations by the participating students. These observations took during the spring semester. Over the two years of the study, we interviewed 61 students from "Madison County" (in groups of 3 or 4) and 23 students from "Bayside" (either individually or in groups of 2 to 3). We also interviewed at least three staff members for each program towards the end (April or May) of

each year. Several staff members were also interviewed at the beginning of the first year. Interviews lasted between 20 and 45 minutes and all interviews were both taped and transcribed. Finally, we conducted pre and post surveys of all participating students in September and June. In the case of Madison County Youth In Public Service, we studied the same program for two years. During the second year, we also were able to administer pre and post surveys to two control classrooms. These classrooms were also twelfth grade government classrooms, served students of similar academic ability, and were taught by the same two teachers. Bayside's program changed significantly after the first year of operation, and so it did not make sense to merge the data from years one and two. In this paper, we report data only from the second year.[3] Nor was an appropriate control classroom available in the case of Bayside. To receive feedback and as a check on our interpretations, we shared analysis on our quantitative and qualitative findings with those who ran the programs.

Measures and Analysis

Survey items were selected in an effort to assess varied outcomes commonly associated with civic priorities. Specifically, we employed measures of commitment to community involvement, personal responsibility, desire to volunteer, vision for how to help, agency as a community actor, and efficacy as a community leader. In addition, since we were interested in understanding how varied curriculum might affect a broader range of concerns related to citizenship, we also used measures that assessed students' interest in politics, their sense of social capital for community development, their beliefs regarding employer responsibility for employees, and their commitment to either structural or individual explanations of poverty. In

[3] For a discussion of the first year experience and findings see (authors, 2001).

addition to scales created by others, we created a number of new scales.[4] Specifically, our government responsibility measure was based on responses to items such as, "Government should fund social programs for those in need;" our measure of employer responsibility used items such as, "Employers should pay wages that are high enough to support a family;" our measure of commitment to working for justice included items such as, "In the next three years, I will work with others to challenge unjust laws"; and our measure of structural/individual explanations for poverty included items such as, "people are poor because (they don't work hard enough/there are not enough jobs that pay decent wages)."

We conducted confirmatory factor analyses to verify that the items in each scale loaded on a single factor. We also computed a Cronbach Alpha for each scale to assess the internal consistency reliability. As detailed in tables 2 and 3, Alphas ranged from .54 to.87. Alphas in this range are consistent with what others have found when using these and similar measures and are acceptable for our purposes.

We used t-tests to see if there were statistically significant pre-post changes for students who participated in particular programs. In addition, since we had two control classrooms as part of our Madison County sample, we also conducted t-tests to see if gains that occurred in the Madison County classrooms that received the treatment (the participation oriented curriculum) were statistically different than those that occurred in the control classrooms.

The interviews and observations were designed to examine similar issues using different methodological approaches. Specifically, student and faculty interviews helped us delve more

---

[4] Measures of commitment to community involvement, personal responsibility, volunteering, and vision, are adapted from the National Learning Through Service Survey developed by the Search Institute. Some of these measures, in turn were adapted from instruments developed by Conrad and Hedin. See Instruments and Scoring Guide of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project (St. Paul: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1981). Items related to Social Capital and Leadership Efficacy draw on a Leadership measure developed for the Community Service Leadership Workshop. Contact Jim Seiber, Issaquah School District 411, Issaquah, WA 98027.

deeply into students' beliefs regarding varied aspects of citizenship and ways features of the curriculum may have affected those perspectives. We explained to students that we were looking at numerous programs related to citizenship and education. We asked: What does it mean to you to be a good citizen? Did the program affect that vision? What kind of a citizen have you been? What kind would you like to be? What people or experiences have influenced your behaviors and beliefs?

We also asked participants to identify and discuss particular social issues that are important to them and to community members. We encouraged them to describe their perspective on the nature of these problems, their causes, and possible ways of responding. Next we asked participants to describe any ways their participation in the given program might have altered their attitudes, knowledge, or skills in relation to either particular civic issues or their perspectives on responsible and effective citizenship.

We asked similar questions of teachers. We wanted to understand their priorities, their conception of responsible and effective citizenship, their perspective on civic education, their strategies, and the ways these approaches did and did not appear to be working. During these interviews we encouraged students and instructors to talk about specific "critical incidents" so that we could better understand the curricular components that promoted varied forms of development. Our methods here were informed by critical incident interviewing techniques (see Flanagan, 1954).

Our observations took place in classrooms and at service sites. In some instances we were able to observe formal public presentations by the participating students. These observations (of at least 4 classroom sessions of each program each year) helped us understand and illustrate program practices. Though we are hesitant to generalize from such a small number

of observations, they were a helpful check on some interpretations of interviews and surveys and we sometimes drew on these observations during interviews.

We analyzed interview and observation data in conjunction with our statistical analysis of survey results. We found that this data enabled us to probe student and teacher beliefs about citizenship, their own civic commitments, the curriculum they experienced, and the relationship of that curriculum to changes in their own beliefs and commitments. commitments interviews enriched, explained, and allowed us to corroborate our interpretation of survey results. The interviews and observations also deepened our understanding of and ability to articulate the meaning of responses to survey items and provided us with insight regarding particular findings. In the case of observations and interviews, the process of data collection and data analysis was recursive, cycling "between thinking about the existing data and generating strategies for collecting new–often better quality–data" (Miles and Huberman, 1984).

The analysis occurred throughout data collection as well as after data collection was complete and followed the process described by Strauss (1990) as the "constant comparative method." This iterative process occurred through reflective and analytical memos between the researchers as well as the ongoing coding of field notes. In particular, we analyzed the interviews for recurring themes and patterns regarding student and teacher perceptions of how participation had affected students' beliefs regarding citizenship and democratic values. We also asked teachers to reflect on our observations not only to test the accuracy of statements but also to re-examine perceptions and conclusions, drawing on their insider knowledge.

The descriptions that follow were captured from field notes and audio tapes. The quotations are verbatim. Names of schools, students, teachers, and geographical references are pseudonyms.

Authors' Predispositions

Given the ideological nature of the content of our inquiry, it makes sense for us to be explicit about our own perspectives with regard to personally responsible citizenship, participatory citizenship, and justice oriented citizenship. We think each vision has merit. However, although we value character traits such as honesty, diligence, and compassion, for reasons already discussed, we find an exclusive emphasis on personally responsible citizenship inadequate for advancing democracy. There is nothing inherently *democratic* about the traits of a personally responsible citizen.

From our perspective, the traits associated with both participatory and justice oriented citizens, on the other hand, are essential. Not every program needs to simultaneously address both sets of goals to be of value. But educators must attend to both sets of priorities if schools are to prepare citizens for democracy.

Developing Participatory Citizens: Madison County Youth In Public Service

Madison County Youth in Public Service is run by two social studies teachers in a rural East Coast community. The idea for Youth in Public Service came to one of the teachers after she had attended a speech by Benjamin Barber about the importance of engaging students in public life. These teachers (one a twenty-year veteran and the other a second year teacher) taught a condensed and intensified version of a standard government course during the first semester of the academic year. For the second semester, they developed a service learning curriculum. Students focused on particular topics related to their government curriculum as they

worked in small teams on public service projects in their county's administrative offices. Their goal, as one teacher explained, "is to produce kids that are active citizens in our community...kids that won't be afraid to go out and take part in their community...kids that understand that you have to have factual evidence to backup anything you say, anything you do."

One group of students investigated whether citizens in their community wanted curbside trash pickup that was organized by the county. They conducted phone interviews, undertook a cost analysis, and examined charts of projected housing growth to estimate growth in trash and its cost and environmental implications. Other students identified jobs that prisoners incarcerated for fewer than 90 days could perform and analyzed the cost of similar programs in other localities; another group helped to develop a five-year plan for the fire and rescue department. For each project, students had to collect and analyze data, interact with government agencies, write a report, and present their findings in a formal hearing before the county's Board of Supervisors.

The teachers of Youth in Public Service believed that placing students in internships where they worked on meaningful projects under the supervision of committed role models would:

- teach students how government worked;
- help students recognize the importance of being actively involved in community issues; and
- provide students with the skills required for effective and informed civic involvement.

Madison County Youth In Public Service was quite successful at achieving those goals. Our interviews, observations, and survey data all indicated that the experience working in the local community had a significant impact on students, especially as it compared to traditional class work. Janine's reaction was typical:

> I learned more by doing this than I would just sitting in a classroom.... I mean, you really don't have hands-on activities in a classroom. But when you go out [to the public agencies] instead of getting to read about problems, we see the problems. Instead of, you know, writing down a solution, we make a solution.

Teresa, another student, said:

> I kind of felt like everything that we had been taught in class, how the whole government works....We got to learn it and we got to go out and experience it. We saw things happening in front of us within the agency. I think it was more useful to put it together and see it happening instead of just reading from a book and learning from it.

Not only did the activities in the community help to enliven classroom learning, but many of the students' projects also tangibly affected the local community. Indeed, students talked about the powerful impact of realizing that what they did would or could make a difference:

> I thought it was just going be another project. You know, we do some research, it gets written down and we leave and it gets put on the shelf somewhere. But in five years, this [curbside recycling] is going to be a real thing....It's really going to happen.

> I didn't expect [our work] to have such an impact.....I mean, we've been in the newspaper, like, a lot.

When asked about how the program influenced their thinking, most students talked about how the experience deepened their belief in the importance of civic involvement.

> I think if more people were aware of [ways they could participate] we wouldn't have as many problems, because they would understand that...people do have an impact. But I think in our community...people just don't seem to think that they will, so they don't even try.

By engaging students in projects in the community, Madison County Youth in Public Service had significant success making learning relevant to students and conveying practical knowledge about how to engage in community affairs. It developed in students the desire to participate in civic affairs and a sense that they can make a difference in the lives of others.

Our survey results illustrate these effects. As detailed in Table 2, there were statistically significant ($p<.05$) changes on several measures related to civic participation. Students expressed a

greater belief that they had a personal responsibility to help others (+0.21), a greater belief that government should help those in need (+0.24), a stronger vision of how to help others (+0.30), a greater belief that they had knowledge regarding ways to support community development (+ 0.94, the greatest gain), a stronger sense that they could be effective leaders (+0.31), and an increased sense of agency–a sense that they could make a difference in their communities (+0.24). Students also reported that they had a personal responsibility to engage community issues (this increase, +0.19, was marginally significant with p=.06).

The robust nature of these results became clearer during the second year because a control group was also surveyed. This group had similar academic skills and were taught by the same two teachers. We used t-tests to examine whether the gains noted above for the students that participated in the Madison County program were different than those that occurred in the control classrooms. In one case, for our measure of agency, we did not find a statistically significant difference (p=.22). Thus, while our data indicates statistically significant gains in agency for students who experienced the Madison County curriculum, it is not clear that these changes were different than those experienced by students in the control classrooms. However, for the other six measures on which Madison County students registered statistically significant gains, we did find a statistically significant (P. < .05) difference between the gains of the students in the Madison County program and those in the control classrooms. This, combined with the fact that the control group did not show statistically significant changes on any survey measures, adds to our confidence that the Madison County curriculum supported student development in ways consistent with a vision of participatory citizenship.

[PLACE TABLE 2 APPROXIMATELY HERE]

The Youth in Public Service program aimed to promote civic participation consistent with a vision of participatory citizenship, to link service to academic content, and to provide a meaningful research experience. We found the program to be notable for its success in these areas. But the program did not aim to foster the justice-oriented citizen's understanding of structural or root causes of problems. While students did study controversial topics—requiring prisoners to work for small or no earnings, for example, or evaluating a detention center for juveniles—they did not critically examine them. They did not examine data regarding the relationship between race, social class, and prison sentencing or question whether increased incarceration has lowered crime rates. They did not examine whether incarcerating juveniles (as opposed to other possible policies) increases or decreases the likelihood of future criminal activity or investigate which groups lobby for tougher or less strict sentencing laws. Nor did they identify or discuss the diverse ideologies that inform political stances on such issues. Similarly, the group of students who were asked to examine their County's tax structure to identify possible ways to finance needed school construction conducted a survey to find out residents' preferences. They found out that 108 of 121 residents said "no" to the idea of a local income tax. These students did not discuss the reasons so many residents oppose a local income tax or examine issues of equity when considering alternative options for taxation.

Students said they learned a great deal about micro-politics such as how different government offices compete for funding, why collaboration between county offices is sometimes difficult, and how to make things happen. However, teachers avoided broader, ideologically-based political issues. One group of students, for example, conducted research for the County Voter Registrar. Their plan was to survey Department of Motor Vehicles' customers to find out how the process could be improved. They struggled for more than a month to get permission

from the DMV to conduct this survey. They were unable to make any progress until they contacted their state representative. Their request was then approved. As a student explained, "I basically learned about how our government works and who has pull." While valuable, their exploration did not consider the ways interest group and party politics have influenced voter registration policies. Students were not asked why some groups opposed practices that would ease the voter registration process.

In general, we did not find evidence in student interviews, our observations, or our analysis of survey data that student projects and associated analysis examined ideological and political issues related to interest groups and the political process, the causes of poverty, different groups' access to health care, or the fairness of different systems of taxation (even though two projects focused on issues related to health care and taxation). Students focused on particular programs and policies and aimed for technocratic/value neutral analysis.

Accordingly, survey data (see Table 2) did not indicate changes in these indicators of democratic values and civic identity—indicators more consistent with the goals of social change than participatory citizenship. The program did not appear to alter students' stated interest in politics or political activity (voting, writing letters) or affect their stated commitment to work for justice. Nor did it alter their perspective on the degree to which structural factors are responsible for poverty.

These findings are consistent with the stated goals of those who run the program. When asked to list characteristics of a "good citizen," program leaders cited qualities such as "honesty," "civic participation," "takes responsibility for others," "becomes involved in solving public problems," "active participant rather than passive," "educated about democracy, makes decisions based on facts," and "loyalty to God/Country." To summarize, then, neither the goals

of the teachers who developed and taught the Youth in Public Service curriculum nor the outcomes we measured included changes in students' interest in politics, their perspective on structural roots of social problems or their commitment to social justice.

Developing Justice Oriented Citizens: Bayside Students For Justice

In a comprehensive urban high school on the West Coast, a group of teachers developed the Bayside Students for Justice curriculum as part of a multi-school program tying school-based academic work to educational experiences in the community. Inspired by the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights, these teachers implemented the Students for Justice curriculum with students diverse in ethnicity, language, and socioeconomic status, 40 percent of whom were living in public housing (see Methods section for complete demographics).

Bayside Students for Justice aimed to develop community activists. As one of the teachers for this program put it, "My goal is to turn students into activists [who are] empowered to focus on things that they care about in their own lives and to…show them avenues that they can use to achieve real social change, profound social change." The program advanced a justice oriented vision of citizenship seeking to teach students how to address structural issues of inequity and injustice and bring about social change. A program developer explained that:

> A good citizen actively organizes with other people [to address] causes of injustice and suffering…A good citizen understands the complexities of social issues, political issues, and economic issues, and how they are tied together, and is not always willing to accept the definition of a problem as presented to them by politicians.

Some students in Bayside Students for Justice studied whether SAT exams are biased and created a pamphlet pointing out the weaknesses of the test in adequately predicting future student success in college. They distributed the pamphlet to the school and surrounding community. Another group examined child labor practices worldwide and the social, political, and economic

issues these practices raise. These students held school-wide forums on their findings in an effort to inform students—many of whom wear the designer clothes and shoes manufactured by the corporations that the group investigated—of the child labor practices of these corporations. They also called on school officials to be aware of the labor practices employed by manufacturers from which the school purchased T-shirts and athletic uniforms. Jason's observation—typical of students interviewed about their experience—reflects the program's emphasis on justice: "It's amazing how all this exploitation is all around us and stuff; I mean we are even wearing clothes and we don't have [any] idea who makes them, how much they're paid, or where they work."

The teachers of the Bayside Students for Justice program believed that having students seek out and address areas of injustice in society would:

- sensitize students to recognize injustice;
- teach students to critically assess root causes of social problems; and
- provide students with an understanding of how to change established systems and structures.

The class that perhaps best illustrates Bayside Students for Justice's focus on critical analysis and social critique was the one led by Nadia Franciscono, one of the Bayside Students For Justice teachers. Ms. Franciscono, a veteran social studies teacher, had her students study a variety of manifestations of violence in their community, including domestic violence, child abuse, and gang violence. They arrived at this choice through a process in which the teacher had them "map" their communities (to gain a sense of what issues affected their own lives and the lives of others) and write about an issue that deeply angered or affected them. Using a weighted vote, students came up with violence as an issue they found both common across their lives and deplorable in its social consequences. Their work on this topic was combined with a domestic

violence curriculum the teacher decided to use and a three-day retreat on violence prevention organized by the violence prevention group "Manalive/Womanalive."

In class, they focused on the causes and consequences of violence in their lives and in their community. They began by sharing stories of their own experiences with violence (at home, in their neighborhood, at school). One student, for example, talked about a shooting incident she had witnessed several blocks from her house. Another wrote about his experience with domestic violence in his family. What made this teacher's approach relatively unique, however, was not the focus on violence; many teachers discuss violence with students in urban classrooms.[5] What made the approach unique was the way this teacher engaged students in a discussion of social, political, and economic causes of violence .

In one classroom activity, students compared demographic data on per capita income broken down by neighborhood with data on the prevalence of violent crime also broken down by neighborhood. Students also explored different beliefs about violence expressed by politicians, writers, the media, and community groups and organizations. At virtually every stage of the curriculum, their own stories and incidents of violence reported in the media were examined in relation to broader social, political, and economic forces. Students used their own and their classmates' experiences as a means for exploring ways to prevent violence and promote human rights and social justice. In another class session, for example, Ms. Franciscono asked "What does violence reveal about what else is going on and how can we fix it?" The class then created a reverse flow chart, starting at the bottom where an incident of domestic violence had occurred and connecting it to events and forces that might have provoked the violence. One student,

[5] In fact, violence prevention lessons are often part of programs that might easily be characterized as developing personally responsible citizens rather than justice oriented citizens (see our section below on "How Might These Visions of Citizenship Overlap in Practice?").

Tameka, posited, "There must have been a lot of tension in the house." The following exchange ensued:

> Teachers: And what might have led to that much tension?
> Keri: Maybe Dad lost his job
> Hector: And then he started drinking
> Keri: Maybe there's no money
> Teacher: We can't really know, right, but there could be a lot of pressure on these people right now.

Even before students started the research and service aspects of their projects, their teacher noted that, through the process of community mapping and choosing their topic, students had begun to think of themselves differently. They had begun to see themselves as part of a youth community with the potential to transform and improve society to make it more just. One student put it this way:

> I can see through all of the veils that we wear. I know it and that is why I have so much anger....I ask why can't it be another way? [How] can I make a difference? One person with good intentions in a bad world cannot make a difference. This is what the structure of our society makes me believe. Yet, I know that if I take the stand others will follow.

Another student said:

> Before this experience, I thought school was just about passing this test or that test...Now I finally see what Malcolm X said: focusing on what matters can let you change yourself and then you can use your knowledge of history to make a better world.

Like their Madison County peers, the Bayside students roundly expressed a passion for the real-world connections to their academic studies. One Bayside Students for Justice class member reported that "I don't like to learn just by reading because it goes in one ear and out the other; but in this class we can really make a difference [by] teaching others about [preventing] violence." Others noted that: "This class was more exciting because it was more real," "We were out there instead of just with our heads in the books," and "I liked feeling like we could do something positive." But these students appeared to take away different lessons as well.

Madison County students spoke extensively during interviews about the micro-politics and technical challenges associated with their projects. "I thought there was cooperation amongst the departments," one Madison student told us, "but then the more we got into it the more I realized Person One is in charge of A, B, and C and Person Two is in charge of X, Y, and Z." Students were frustrated that various departments did not work well together and with what they identified as "turf issues." Many noted a poor working relationship between the County and the City. Students could also detail the skills they used (conducting polls, interviewing officials, making presentations, reading legislation) as well as the knowledge they gained about how government works. However, Madison students were not able to talk about how varied interests and power relationships or issues of race and social class might be related to the lack of consensus on priorities and the inability of these varied groups to work effectively together.

To a much greater degree, Bayside's students talked about the need for forms of civic involvement that addressed issues of social justice and macro-level critique of society. When asked whether violence prevention programs like the Manalive retreat the students attended could eliminate violence, Desiree eagerly praised the program but then added:

> There's some things that you see out there, the struggle [when] people are trying to do their best but still they're being brought down by society, and I think that's very troublesome.

Other students also emphasized the need to address root causes of problems such as poverty, governmental neglect, and racism. After telling the class about his cousin who was arrested for carrying a weapon, Derrick wondered aloud to the class about how best to proceed:

> It would be great if nobody had weapons but where does [the violence] begin? If the police are discriminating [and] if I can't get a job…there's going to be a lot of anger…The police aren't going to act better because [I'm] trying to make my neighborhood better."

And Tamika put it this way: "Lots of people want to be nice [but] if you don't got food for your kids, how nice is that?"

Bayside Students for Justice also expressed skepticism of corporate-sponsored civic initiatives (Coca Cola's sponsoring of Earth Day activities, for example, or Phillip Morris initiatives to "build our communities"). They felt that, in general, it was unwise to count on businesses to set the tone for improving communities or solving difficult problems that do not have "making money" or advertising as a goal.

In contrast to programs that seek to teach that "one person can make a difference," Bayside Students For Justice emphasized the need to address social problems collectively. In interviews and written assignments for class, students demonstrated their understanding of a collective rather than individual vision for effecting change. After listening in class to the song, "We Who Believe in Freedom" by Sweet Honey in the Rock, one young man wrote that "whether the struggle is big or small it should be everyone's responsibility together....Movements are not about me, they're about us." Another student observed that "In the classroom, it seems like everyone works as an individual to better themselves, but in this class, we're working as a group to better everything around us."

[PLACE TABLE 3 APPROXIMATELY HERE]

Survey results also reflected Bayside's emphasis on social change (see Table 3). Surveys of Bayside students revealed significant increases on items measuring interest in politics (+0.33) and structural explanations for poverty (+0.28) – scales on which Youth In Public Service students showed no change. Bayside students also indicated an increased sense of civic agency

(+0.47) and an increased belief that government had a responsibility to help those in need (+0.29).

Unlike the Youth In Public Service students, however, Bayside students did not demonstrate much specific knowledge about particular community groups or about the technical challenges and possibilities associated with specific policies and initiatives.

While students who participated in Madison County Youth In Public Service reported statistically significant ($p<.05$) gains on survey items linked to leadership skills, vision, and knowledge related to civic participation (as well as in their sense of personal responsibility to help others), Bayside students did not.

The Political Importance of Recognizing Different Conceptions of Citizenship

Did Madison County Youth in Public Service do a better job than Bayside Students for Justice at educating citizens or was Bayside more effective? The goal of our paper is not to answer this question, but rather, to make clear that different democratic values were embedded in these efforts. Both programs were effective at achieving goals consistent with their respective underlying conceptions of citizenship. Yet our qualitative and quantitative data regarding these programs demonstrate important differences in impact. Youth in Public Service appeared to have a powerful impact on students' capacities for and commitments to civic participation. Measures of students' sense of personal responsibility to help others, their vision of how to help, and their leadership efficacy show significant changes (see Table 4). Especially notable in both the survey and interview data was the change in students' confidence that they had the knowledge or "social capital" to make things happen in the community. Interviews, observations, and examples of student work all reinforced the survey finding of a dramatic (+.94)

increase in students' knowledge of what resources were available to help with community projects and of how to contact and work effectively with community organizations to mobilize those resources. This confidence grew out of their involvement in substantive projects that required frequent interaction with multiple community actors and agencies.

We did not, however, see evidence that the Youth in Public Service program sparked interest in or conveyed knowledge of broad social critiques and systemic reform. Since such issues were not discussed as part of the curriculum, it is not surprising that students' perspectives on the structural and individual causes of poverty, for example, did not change as a result of their participation. Nor did their interest in talking about or being involved in politics change.

In comparison, the Bayside Students For Justice curriculum appeared to emphasize social critique significantly more and technocratic skills associated with participation somewhat less. To the extent that Bayside students learned about participatory skills, they focused on extra-governmental social activism that challenged rather than reinforced existing norms (such as community organizing or protesting). For example, students were more likely at the end of the program than at the beginning to posit structural explanations for social problems (stating, for example, that the problem of poverty resulted from too few jobs that pay wages high enough to support a family rather than being a result of individuals being lazy and not wanting to work). They were more likely than their Madison County peers to be interested in and want to discuss politics and political issues, and they were more likely to seek redress of root causes of difficult social ills. As one student told us after several months in the Bayside program, "when the economy's bad and people start blaming immigrants or whoever else they can blame, they've got to realize that there are big social, economic, and political issues tied together, that it's not the immigrants, no it's bigger than them."

Evidence from observations, interviews, student work, and surveys of Bayside's students did not, however, show an increase in students' knowledge about particular community resources. Unlike their Madison County peers, Bayside students' sense that they were effective community leaders (knowing how to run meetings, for example) remained unchanged. Nor was there any increase in students *personal* responsibility to help others (as opposed to their inclination for collective action for change that was frequently expressed during interviews).

[PLACE TABLE 4 APPROXIMATELY HERE]

As noted earlier, those committed to educating social activists who practice justice oriented citizenship would ideally want to couple critical analysis of root causes of injustice with opportunities to develop capacities for participation. They want students to be able to both analyze and understand structural causes of deeply entrenched social problems *and* gain the skills and motivation to act by participating in local and national politics and community forums. But a focus on justice guarantees neither the motivation nor the capacity to participate in democratic change. Many—ourselves included—would applaud programs that manage to emphasize justice-oriented citizenship inextricably linked to a desire and capacity for participation. However, our findings indicate that the commitment to participation and the capacities it entails are not necessarily coupled with those related to the pursuit of social justice. Indeed, engaging in critical analysis does not necessarily foster the ability or the commitment to participate. The reverse is also true: students can learn to participate without engaging in critical analysis that focuses on macro structural issues, the role of interest groups, power dynamics, and/or social justice. The ability to spot injustice is not organically linked to the inclination or the ability to take action.

The relative emphasis placed on these differing goals will likely depend on numerous factors. These include: the structure of the curriculum, the priorities of those designing and implementing the initiative, and the time available for such instruction. Moreover, the political constraints and value based priorities of both administrators and community members are also likely to affect the structure of the curriculum. The importance of community values was evident, for example, in the reaction of the Youth In Public Service Director to the social critique focus of Bayside Students For Justice and other groups (who met three times during our study to discuss their programs with each other). She told us: "If my superintendent or board heard me saying what you all are saying, I'd be fired." Context matters.

Thus, answering the question "Which program better develops citizens?" necessarily engages the politics that surround varied conceptions of citizenship. The relationship between pedagogical choices and political positions is an important one. Those who view civic participation as of primary importance would likely view the Madison County Youth In Public Service program as extraordinarily effective. On the other hand, those who believe that the pursuit of social justice is of paramount importance might well be troubled that participants in the Madison County program did not talk about the need for structural change, about methods used historically to bring change about (those employed by various social movements, for example), or about social injustice. Educators who wish to teach students to support social change might therefore value the explicit attention and critiques students participating in Bayside Students for Justice developed. Bayside students learned ways that the interests of powerful groups are often supported by institutions and social structures. They also expanded their interest in following broader local and national political issues.

How Might These Visions of Citizenship Overlap in Practice?

To note the distinctions between *personally responsible*, *participatory*, and *justice oriented* citizenship is not to imply that multiple goals cannot be pursued simultaneously. In fact, some programs achieve varied combinations of these different priorities. Consider, for example, the goals of personal responsibility and social justice. Often, these two priorities conflict. For example, as noted earlier, a focus on the character traits "obedience" and "loyalty" work against the kind of critical reflection and action required of a justice oriented citizen. But personal responsibility and social justice are not always conflicting goals.

Making the Personal Political

The Bayside Students For Justice program, while placing primary emphasis on justice oriented citizenship, nonetheless incorporated a strong commitment to personal responsibility. The retreat that the Bayside Students For Justice attended on violence prevention taught students to work hard at controlling anger and stressed the need to always consider the consequences of their actions. Many character traits of a personally responsible citizen are important to Bayside's enactment of the justice oriented citizen.

Unlike many programs that emphasize personal responsibility, however, Bayside's approach does not merely exhort students to adopt certain values or behaviors such as self-control, honesty, punctuality, and caring for others; it also includes an implicit critique of the way society is structured and examines the relationship between those structures and the way individuals behave. Approaches like those used by Nadia Franciscono challenge a conservative focus on personal responsibility without rejecting the basic premise that how children and adults behave is important. These approaches conclude that an individual's character does matter, but

that character can best be understood – and changed – through social analysis and attention to root causes of social injustices. The program seeks to enhance students' understanding of society rather than simply giving students a list of values they are to embrace and behaviors they are magically to adopt.

Under the Manalive curriculum, Franciscono's students discussed social, political, and economic factors that reinforce notions that men are superior to women and that they should enforce that superiority if it is challenged. As a result, some men turn violent and some women learn to tolerate their violence. Franciscono's students talked about their own experiences with violence in order to better understand and develop strategies to change institutions, structures, or conditions that cause or encourage violent behavior.

Contrasting this curricular approach with the Character Counts! Coalition's take on how to avoid violence, it becomes clear the ways Bayside Students for Justice incorporates important aspects of the personally responsible citizen into its emphasis on both understanding unjust social contexts and pursuing just ones. Recall that the Character Counts! coalition advocates respect, good manners, dealing peacefully with anger, and so on. Franciscono points out the limitations of this version of personal responsibility for teaching what she considers to be good citizenship by highlighting what she sees as the simplistic questions and answers that character education poses. She sees character educators making fallacious assumptions: "If I were individually responsible, the world would be a better place. There wouldn't be racism. There wouldn't be sexism…I think the authentic self is lovely [but] you get trained in these roles."

If there is a lesson to be learned about personal responsibility for Franciscono, it is that the personal is political, that personal experiences and behavior both result from and are indicators of broader political forces. For Bayside Students For Justice, personal responsibility

derives from studying and seeking to change these forces. With this recognition, Franciscono is able to structure curriculum that promotes citizens who are both personally responsible and justice oriented.

Conclusion

Proponents of the democratic purposes of education frequently complain that they are fighting an uphill battle. Traditional academic priorities and the current narrow emphasis on test scores crowd out other possibilities (eg. Cuban & Shipps, 2000; Noddings, 1999). Given public schools' central role in helping to shape citizens, this conflict clearly is worthy of attention.

But what kind of citizens are the schools trying to shape? As educators interested in schooling's civic purposes, we maintain that it is not enough to argue that democratic values are as important as traditional academic priorities. We must also ask what kind of values. What political and ideological interests are embedded in varied conceptions of citizenship? Varied priorities–personal responsibility, participatory citizenship and justice oriented citizenship–embody significantly different beliefs regarding the capacities and commitments citizens need in order for democracy to flourish; and they carry significantly different implications for pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation, and educational policy. An initiative that supports the development of personally responsible citizens may not be effective at increasing participation in local and national civic affairs. Moreover, efforts to pursue some conceptions of personal responsibility can undermine efforts to prepare participatory and justice oriented citizens.

In addition, our study of Madison County Youth In Public Service and of Bayside Students for Justice demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between programs that emphasize participatory citizenship and those that emphasize the pursuit of justice. While each

program was effective in achieving its goals, qualitative and quantitative data regarding these programs demonstrated important differences in each program's impact. The study indicates that programs that champion participation do not necessarily develop students' abilities to analyze and critique root causes of social problems and visa versa. Although those committed to the Democratic purposes of education may extol the value of linking priorities related to participation and justice, our study indicates that this outcome is not guaranteed. If both goals are priorities, those designing and implementing curriculum must give both explicit attention.

From the standpoint of research and evaluation, the implications for those interested in the development of democratic values and capacities are significant. Studies that fail to reflect the varied range of educational priorities in relation to democratic values and capacities will tell only part of the story. Moreover, the development of citizens cannot be assessed in the same way that we commonly assess the ability to decode words or solve a math problem. There are not "right" answers or sometimes even "better" answers to many relevant questions. Knowing, for example, whether a student now places greater emphasis on recycling or on environmental regulation does not enable us to say that a program was effective. However, it does help us understand the program's effects.

In acknowledging a lack of "right" answers, we do not mean to imply a sense of neutrality with respect to varied conceptions of democratic values. Instead, we mean to emphasize that politics and the interests of varied groups are often deeply embedded in the ways we conceptualize and study efforts to educate for democracy. Politics and the interests associated with the varied conceptions therefore require close attention. We can focus on whether a given curriculum changes students' sense of personal responsibility, government responsibility, or employer responsibility, for example. If we ask only about personal

responsibility (and if discussions of personal responsibility are disconnected from analysis of the social, economic, and political context), we may well be reinforcing a conservative and individualistic notion of citizenship, that of the *personally responsible citizen*. Yet this is the focus of many programs and of their associated evaluations. If citizenship also requires collective participation and critical analysis of social structures, then other lenses are needed as well.

Those designing curriculum and those studying its impact must be cognizant of and responsive to these important distinctions and their political implications. The choices we make have consequences for the kind of society we ultimately help to create.

Acknowledgements

This research was generously supported by two grants from the Surdna Foundation. We also wish to thank Harry Boyte, Pamela Burdman, Bernadette Chi, Larry Cuban, Norm Fruchter, Jeff Howard, Gordon Lafer, Bethany Rogers, Robert Sherman, Dorothy Shipps, and Jim Toole. The authors are solely responsible for any and all conclusions.

References

Ayers, W., hunt, J. A., & Quinn, T. Eds. (1998). *Teaching for social justice*. New York: The New Press and Teachers College Press

Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barber, B. (1992). *An aristocracy of everyone: The politics of education and the future of America*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Barber, B. (1998). *A place for us: How to make society civil and democracy strong*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Boyte, H. C. (1991). Community service and civic education. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 72 (10), 765-67.wake-up

Boyte, H. C. & Kari, N. N. (1996). *Building America: The democratic promise of public work.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Counts, G. (1932). Dare progressive education be progressive? *Progressive Education* 9:257-63.

Cronbach, L. J. (1982). *Designing Evaluations of Educational and Social Programs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cuban, L. & Shipps, D. Eds. (2000). *Reconstructing the common good in education: Coping with intractable American dilemmas.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Datta, L. (1997). "A pragmatic basis for mixed-method designs." *New Directions for Evaluation*, 74, 33-46.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51 (4), 327-358.

Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Greene, J. C. and Caracelli, V. J. (1997a). "Defining and describing the paradigm issue in mixed-method evaluation." *New Directions for Evaluation*, 74, 5-17.

Kaestle, C.F. (2000) "Toward a political economy of citizenship: Historical perspectives on the purposes of common schools." In McDonnell, L., Timpane, P.M., & Benjamin, R. Eds. *Rediscovering the democratic purposes of education.* Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Kahne, J. & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the Service of What? The Politics of Service Learning. *Phi Delta Kappan.* 77(9), 593-599.

Kahne, J., Westheimer, J., & Rogers, B. (2001). Service learning and citizenship: Directions for research, *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.*

Lickona, T. (1993). The return of character education. *EducationalLeadership.* 51(3),6-11.

Mann, H. (1838). *First Annual Report.* Boston: Dutton & Wentworth.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, M.A. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

National Association of Secretaries of State, (1999). *New millennium Project-Phase I: A nationwide study of 15-24 year old youth.* Alexandria, VA: the Tarrance Group.

Newmann, F. (1975). *Education for citizen action : challenge for secondary curriculum.* Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Pub. Corp.

Noddings, N. (1999). Renewing democracy in schools. *Phi Delta Kappan.* 80(8), 579-83.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pangle, L. S. & Pangle, T. L. (1993). *The learning of liberty*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Patton, M. Q. (1988). "Paradigms and pragmatism." In D. M. Fetterman (ed.), *Qualitative Approaches to Evaluation in Education: The Silent Scientific Revolution*. New York: Praeger.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rugg, H. O. (1921). Reconstructing the curriculum: An open letter to Professor Henry Johnson commenting on Committee Procedure as illustrated by the Report of the Joint Committee on History and Education for Citizenship. *Historical Outlook*, 12, 184-189. Reprinted in Parker, W. C. ed. (1996). *Educating the democratic mind*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sax, L. J., Astin, A., Korn, W. S., & Mahoney, K. (1999). *The American freshman: National norms for Fall 1999*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Schudson, M. (1998). *The good citizen: A history of American civic life*. New York: Free Press.

Smith, R. M. (1997). *Civic ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U.S. history*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Strauss, A. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory, procedures, and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Verba, S. Schlozman, K. L., Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic volunteerism in American politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Westheimer, J. and Kahne, J. (2000). Service learning required—but what exactly do students learn? *Education Week*, January 26. Back Page Commentary. 42.

Wynne, E. A. (1986). "The great tradition in education: Transmitting moral values." *Educational Leadership*. 43(4),4-9.

From "What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy" by Joel Westheimer & Joseph Kahne

Table 1. Kinds of Citizens[†]

	Personally Responsible Citizen	Participatory Citizen	Justice Oriented Citizen
DESCRIPTION	Acts responsibly in his/her community Works and pays taxes Obeys laws Recycles, gives blood Volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis	Active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts Organizes community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, or clean up environment Knows how government agencies work Knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks	Critically assesses social, political, and economic structures to see beyond surface causes Seeks out and addresses areas of injustice Knows about social movements and how to effect systemic change
SAMPLE	Contributes food to a food drive	Helps to organize a food drive	Explores why people are hungry and acts to solve root causes
CORE ASSUMPTIONS	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must question and change established systems and structures when they reproduce patterns of injustice over time

[†]For help in structuring this table, we are indebted to James Toole and a focus group of Minnesota teachers.

Table 2. Madison County Youth In Public Service

FACTORS (Chronbach's Alpha pre, post)	SAMPLE	CHANGE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	Significance Level	Number of Students
PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO ENGAGE COMMUNITY ISSUES (.54, .71)	Intervention	.19	4.27	4.46	.06	61
	Control	-.10	3.89	3.99	.54	37
PERSONAL kESPONSIBILITY TO HELP OTHERS(.62, .74)	Intervention	.21*	4.00	4.21	.01	61
	Control	-.06	3.99	3.92	.63	37
I WILL VOLUNTEER (.80, .86)	Intervention	.10	3.59	3.70	.14	61
	Control	-.09	3.28	3.18	.43	37
AGENCY TO IMPROVE COMMUNITY (.66, .71)	Intervention	.24**	3.78	4.02	.00	61
	Control	.10	3.38	3.48	.34	37
VISION TO HELP (.65, .71)	Intervention	.30*	2.65	2.95	.01	61
	Control	.12	2.63	2.75	.35	37
KNOWLEDGE/SOCIAL CAPITAL FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (.67, .72)	Intervention	.94**	3.95	4.89	.00	60
	Control	-.23	3.13	2.90	.25	37
LEADERSHIP EFFICACY (.78, .81)	Intervention	.31**	3.60	3.91	.00	61
	Control	.03	3.57	3.60	.72	37
FOLLOW THE NEWS (.43, .41)	Intervention	.24**	3.35	3.59	.00	60
	Control	-.12	3.22	3.10	.27	37
INTEREST IN POLITICS (.81, .81)	Intervention	.03	3.41	3.44	.55	61
	Control	-.05	2.76	2.71	.63	37
WORK FOR JUSTICE (.65, .73)	Intervention	.07	3.07	3.14	.31	61
	Control	.03	2.84	2.88	.81	37
GOV'T RESPONSIBILITY FOR THOSE IN NEED (.68, .61)	Intervention	.24 *	3.10	3.34	.05	32
	Control	.00	3.28	3.28	1.00	37
EMPLOYER RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYEES (.83, .87)	Intervention	.09	3.81	3.9	.35	32
	Control	-.02	4.14	4.12	.83	37
STRUCTURAL/INDIVIDUAL EXPLANATIONS FOR POVERTY (.59, .61)	Intervention	-.10	3.13	3.03	.56	32
	Control	.14	3.37	3.51	.35	37

*p < .05; **p < .01

Table 3. Bayside Students for Justice

FACTORS (Chronbach's Alpha pre, post)	CHANGE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	Significance Level	Number of Students
PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO ENGAGE COMMUNITY ISSUES (.54, .71)	.07	3.58	3.45	.77	21
PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO HELP OTHERS(.62, .74)	.09	3.84	3.94	.60	21
I WILL VOLUNTEER (.80, .86)	.18	3.10	3.28	.22	21
AGENCY TO IMPROVE COMMUNITY (.66, .71)	.47*	3.03	3.50	.04	21
VISION TO HELP (.65, .71)	.36	2.43	2.79	.15	21
KNOWLEDGE/SOCIAL CAPITAL FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (.67, .72)	.17	2.76	2.93	.43	21
LEADERSHIP EFFICACY (.78, .81)	.12	3.13	3.26	.03 .36	21
FOLLOW THE NEWS (.43, .41)	.27*	3.13	3.40	.02	21
INTEREST IN POLITICS (.81, .81)	.33*	2.68	3.01	.02	21
WORK FOR JUSTICE (.65, .73)	-.09	3.19	3.10	.54	21
GOV'T RESPONSIBILITY FOR THOSE IN NEED (.68, .61)	.29*	3.19	3.48	.05	21
EMPLOYER RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYEES (.83, .87)	-.05	4.37	4.32	.73	21
STRUCTURAL/INDIVIDUAL EXPLANATIONS FOR POVERTY (.59, .61)	.28*	3.88	4.16	.04	21

*$p < .05$

Table 4. Educating for Different Kinds of Citizenship

PRE-POST CHANGE

FACTORS	MADISON COUNTY YOUTH IN PUBLIC SERVICE	BAYSIDE STUDENTS FOR JUSTICE
PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO HELP OTHERS	.21*	.09
VISION TO HELP	.30*	.36
KNOWLEDGE/SOCIAL CAPITAL FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	.94**	.17
LEADERSHIP EFFICACY	.31**	.12
INTEREST IN POLITICS	.03	.33*
STRUCTURAL/INDIVIDUAL EXPLANATIONS FOR POVERTY	-.10	.28*

*p < .05; **p < .01

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)

National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: What Kind of Citizen: The Politics of Educating For Democracy	
Author(s): Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	**Level 2A**	**Level 2B**
☑	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Joel Westheimer	Printed Name/Position/Title: Joel Westheimer
Organization/Address: University of Ottawa, Faculty of Education, 145 Jean-Jacques Lussier, Lamoureux Hall, RM 486, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5	Telephone: 613-230-8077
	Fax:
	E-mail Address: joelwestheimer@mac.com
	Date: 3/20/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706
Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)